



UWS Academic Portal

Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde

McPhee, Iain; Holligan, Chris; McLean, Robert; Deuchar, Ross

Published in:
Drugs and Alcohol Today

DOI:
[10.1108/DAT-07-2018-0035](https://doi.org/10.1108/DAT-07-2018-0035)

Published: 03/06/2019

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication on the UWS Academic Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

McPhee, I., Holligan, C., McLean, R., & Deuchar, R. (2019). Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde: the strange case of the two selves of clandestine drug users in Scotland. *Drugs and Alcohol Today*, 19(2), 133-146.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/DAT-07-2018-0035>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UWS Academic Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact pure@uws.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Emerald Open Access Policy: "As soon as we've published an article, the version of the article that has been accepted for publication, the Author Accepted Manuscript (AAM) can be used for a variety of non-commercial scholarly purposes, subject to full attribution."

http://www.emeraldgrouppublishing.com/openaccess/oa_policies.htm



**Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde: The Strange Case of the Two Selves
of Clandestine Drug Users**

Journal:	<i>Drugs and Alcohol Today</i>
Manuscript ID	DAT-07-2018-0035.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	drug taking, Qualitative research, social identity, illicit, illegal, ethnography

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde

The Strange Case of the Two Selves of Clandestine Drug Users in Scotland

Drugs and Alcohol Today

The perception illicit drug use is problematic, to be solved via medicine, social work and drug enforcement agencies is widespread (McPhee et al, 2012). This article disputes such discourse and argues the user of illicit drugs should not be homogenised. Illicit drug use is one activity amongst many that (some) people, conventionally, pursue. The article draws upon qualitative research that utilised a bricoleur ethnographic methodology (Rodgers 2012). The focus is on the drug taking of non-treatment seeking illegal drug users. Findings reveal this demography manage conflicted social identities. The potential stigma of being discovered as an illicit drug user generates strategies to secure a clandestine self, (i.e. Mr. Hyde). The paper explores how and in what way socially competent drug users differ from others who are visible to the authorities as criminals by criminal justice bureaucracies and known to treatment agencies as defined problem drug users.

Keywords: drug addiction, identity, illicit drugs, sociology, ethnography

Context

Dr. Jekyll and Mr Hyde is a gothic novella by Scottish author Robert Louise Stevenson (1886). His choice of the name 'Hyde' symbolises this character whom prefers not to be recognised. Stevenson argues humans have a dual conflictual nature, and proposes the soul is an inherent battleground where an 'angel' and 'fiend' struggle for dominance. Hyde is situated in dark side which squeezes out Dr. Jekyll. Man's essential nature lies hidden beneath the veneer of civilisation. Although 'dark' illicit drug consumption is a site of "extreme enjoyment" lying outside the capitalist economy of desire and legitimate consumption (Bjerg 2008). Contrary to received opinion that the enjoyment of the drug user undermines desire for other pleasures and things (Bjerg, 2008), the symbolic order inhabited by Stevenson's fictive being manages to overcome psychoactive drug domination and maintain the positive self-representation of "socially integrated drug users" (Rodner et al 2005).

Like Stevenson, we propose a homo duplex. Our model of the self is one that is both alert to convention and fearful of stigma should the 'fiend', the illicit drug-taker, be discovered. If the stigmatised self, Hyde, were revealed, his/her civil death would ensue. Hyde would have won, but at a cost. The tenability avoiding this perilous outcome supports the thesis that the physiological effects of drug taking does not dominate behaviour and that cultural factors inform outcomes (Shewan et al 2005; Weinberg, 2002). Sociological analyses of drug addiction propose that to assist

1
2
3 addiction recovery we should emphasise it as a project of activating a self-identity
4 which is integrated (Weinberg 2002). Neale et al (2010) note the difficulty captured or
5
6 known problem users have as a result of recovery processes attempts to reclaim and
7
8 restore an unspoiled identity.
9
10
11

12
13 This article focuses on the illicit drug use of a neglected hidden population of
14 drugs takers who are not formally identified as problem users. The non-captured drug
15 taker has never sought treatment, nor been imprisoned for either drug possession or
16 unruly behaviour while intoxicated.
17
18
19
20
21

22 The intentionally unseen (McPhee 2013) suggested that there were hidden users
23 'out there' unknown to services and the police, and even friends and families. This
24 paper explains theoretically how hidden populations use agency as protective factors to
25 avoid becoming known as drug takers by resisting the othering that accompanies how
26 structures and language construct the typical drug user identity as spoiled, contagious,
27 evil and beyond retribution (McPhee 2009, MCPhee 2013).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 The research question the study examines is: How and in what way does a
38 climate of moral legal and medical censure and ensuing societal reaction to the use of
39 certain drugs, impact on the social worlds of non-treatment seeking illicit drug users?
40 We explore the social experiences of hidden and unseen drug users who live through
41 their careers as drug takers in a moral universe from which they would be excluded if
42 their 'clandestine' identity were revealed to 'outsiders' (Becker 1963). The specific
43 empirical objectives were to explore the participants' subjective experiences of being
44 hidden drug takers and how these intersect with their status as otherwise 'normal' and
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

productive law-abiding citizens. Emphasis rests on the function that drug use plays in their hidden social identity. To that end our analysis explores membership of sub-cultures deemed deviant by society (Parker et al., 1998; Hammersley, 2011, Hammersley et al, 2001).

Orne (2013) using Goffman’s classic work, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of a Spoiled Identity* (1963), found queer young people capable of maintaining a “double consciousness” by using management strategies, for instance, by either disengaging or by tailoring their identity to conform. The ‘discredited’ individual conceals stigma by covering and preventing the stigma trait from “looming large” and being a focus for interactional attributions. The aim is to prevent a loss in status, and worse, criminalisation. Goffman (1959, 1971) argues the ability to present oneself as a moral actor is crucial in enabling participation in, and maintaining, full membership of the moral societal community. He coins the notion ‘career’ to apply to any practice that implies a career path of a social identity. Goffman’s career concept (1961:119) refers to ‘any social strand of a person’s course through life’. He argues progression through life as a social actor is a career. The ‘backstage’ in his dramaturgical model of the social refers to what is hidden in contrast to the ‘frontstage’ which is public. Goffman’s multiplex view of identity is a presentation in response to the perceived demands of everyday life including normative expectations that others may hold.

‘Hidden populations’ is a euphemistic phrase often applied by convention to marginalised groups, i.e. homeless, criminals, sex workers and class-A drug users (Frank & Snijders, 1994; Griffiths, et al. 1993). Shewan et al (2005) argue drug

research ought to incorporate hidden populations and desist from concluding that chemical effects of drugs are always addictive and destructive. In their study of heroin users, they propose destructive outcomes emerge not necessarily from drug toxicity, but from the attendant psychological and social effects of drug taking; culture and psychology are potential causal factors responsible for adverse effects (Golub et al, 2005). Heroin can be used over considerable duration and by those who have no contact with agencies, nor criminal records. On the contrary most of their experienced user sample were in employment and Higher Education. Weinberg (2002) argues against the received medicalised position that drug addiction and its effects are located in pathological deficiencies. Instead Weinberg (2002) proposes key elements of addiction are cultural and social transgression which transmits the meanings of the addiction process which some argue in the case of "methadone maintenance" equates to a bio-political discipline (Bourgeois, 2000).

Axel Klein (2011) argues the symbolic and ideological functions of drug policy triumph over scientific objectivity. Some researchers are sceptical about drug policy objectives (Berridge and Thom, 1996; Seddon, 2011; Seddon, 2005, Seddon et al., 2008; Duke 2001; Ashton 2006). Critics describe the tendency to play down value conflicts and power struggles that occur between various agencies of social control, particularly medicine and law enforcement, which create factions and opposing stakeholder interests. The possession of drugs that have been defined as illegal breaks the law within the confines of the United Kingdom Misuse of Drugs Act 1971. Criminalising drug takers, and medicalising the use of drugs, valorises the abstinent

identity of non-drug users as a norm, thereby creating binary categories of drug users and non-drug users, and by extension, good healthy citizens and bad unhealthy criminogenic citizens (Brown, 2007; McPhee 2013). Since the formation of the UN conventions in 1961 and 1971, the use of certain drugs, i.e. opiates, cocaine and cannabis, have been linked to addiction, crime and deviance (Szasz 2003; Goode, 2006). Weinberg (2002) argues that we must “de-naturalise addiction” and foreground its sociology. In this vein Hammersley (2011) argues research ought to shift away from theorising “drug-users” and instead explore “drug-use” as a strategy of avoiding medicalising this field.

Methodology

Using methods employed by McPhee (2013) and informed by the work of Pearson (2001) provided an ‘emic’ and an ‘etic’ view (Headland et al., 1990) in identifying and recruiting participants. That view is articulated within the frames of reference of an insider, as opposed to a purely ‘etic’ framework of understanding from the perspective of the ‘objective’ outsider. As part of a wider study on drug use and drug distribution we included observational field notes at events where drug taking occurred, semi-structured interviews and informal discussions with over 30 drug users at varying ‘career’ stages. Transcripts and summaries of 24 of these have been produced that document their views. Salient extracts from participants are included in the paper to provide insights in relation to issues surrounding the research question.

Recruitment and inclusion exclusion criterion

Initially four 'gatekeepers' provided researchers with an introduction to drug users who fitted the inclusion criteria. They had to have been current or former users of illegal drugs and have not had any contact with any treatment agency or service. Potential participants were excluded on the basis of having had experience of formal treatment or contact with the criminal justice system for drug offences.

After gatekeeper networks had been exhausted, the researchers reverted to a wider chain referral network to recruit further participants. This method of selection via the first social gathering to recruit participants yielded several suitable participants. This method of selection involved mentioning exactly what type of user the researchers were interested in, for example an equal number of male and female users¹ and a large enough sample of opiate experienced users.

Anonymity was assured and identifying details (known only to researchers) were kept separate from recordings and transcripts. Interviews lasted one hour and took place in a private room ensuring confidentiality. Using a digital recorder, participants were asked to explore their experiences of using controlled drugs. Data saturation occurred after 24 full transcriptions were typed and coded descriptively. A selection of transcripts were read to allow the main (sub)themes to emerge. The method of structured thematic analysis using inductive and deductive processes was used (Neale 2016). After a coding structure was compiled, all transcripts were read and analysed using this method.

¹ Examining gender differences in detail was not a research objective.

Table 1 and 2 here (see appendix 1)

FINDINGS

Table 1 documents drug types, and frequency. Table 2 indicates demographic details of participants documented at the onset of the semi structured interviews. Information regarding age, residence, age at first drug use, age they first injected drugs, current status, and in particular whether they had ever used heroin, a drug particularly feared and demonised, is included.

The strategies participants used to remain hidden included identity rejections, identity exchanges and identity concealment.

Identity rejections

Problematic drug users are most associated in stereotypical constructions of user identities as heroin injectors, or heroin injectors in waiting. This was a stereotype firmly resisted by participants. Gilbert, an intermittent user of several drugs including MDMA and ketamine, described ‘problematic users’. This was an identity he rejected:

‘The lowest of the low. They don’t work, get by in life on drugs and that’s wrong.’ - (Gilbert)

When asked to characterise traits and qualities which signified being a problematic drug user, Alison stated:

1
2
3 'Out of control, promiscuous, [selfish], losing control...the way they view things
4
5 [results in their] social network disappear [ing],’ - (Alison).
6
7
8
9

10 Alison’s statement supports literature in that recreational users are at risk of
11 becoming problematic users should 1) sufficient and 2) continual exposure to drugs
12 occur. This view was consistent among all opiate naive participants and fits with wider
13 public discourse. Yet, this was not a view shared by opiate experienced participants.
14
15 Kilroy presented a more nuanced opinion whereby he did not consider the drugs
16 themselves to be the main variable resulting in problematic use:
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 'If you’ve got a coke addiction then you’ve got to be a high-flyer, you’ve got to
28 be pulling in the money. I don’t see those types of people in a sort of greasy-
29 haired spotty way as I would imagine heroin users, junkie[s].’ – (Kilroy)
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Kilroy drew attention to economic resources, and other types of capital, that
38 individuals may have at their disposal. Kilroy used this as a tool for measuring what is,
39 or more likely to become, ‘problematic’. Addiction is more than drug exposure alone.
40
41 Rather a user’s economic situation may be an important factor in influencing drug
42 choice, as well as consumption method, and ensuing consequences. In general
43 participants repeated and endorsed perceptions that heroin users, and more so
44 injectors, were ‘untrustworthy’, and different from *their* own sensible controlled use
45 (McPhee 2013). Significantly, some participants, considered addicts as biologically
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

different from non-addicted users. Juliet argued some are 'born addicts', alluding to the phenomenon known as 'crack baby syndrome' when referring to 'heroin bab[ies]':

'Some might have been born...a heroin baby and they've got it in their blood.' -
(Juliet).

Isabel further emphasized the point that addiction is inherited, and viewed addicts as having:

'...a tendency to be schizophrenic, so they've got that imbalance in their head. I don't think these drugs will necessarily...give you psychological problems but if you have that gene within you [beforehand] then that might be the thing that sways it.' - (Isabel).

Leshners' (2000) hijacked brain theory likewise suggests addiction is primarily biological, and recognised or diagnosed by a loss of control over use. A significant proportion of participants described the connection between addictive drugs, for example heroin, with an innate addictive nature, as being likely to result in problematic drug use:

1
2
3 '[problematic users] just wait for their next dole cheque or wage to get more
4 drugs. That is somebody who lets the drug use them rather than them using the
5 drug.' - (Robert).
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Robert, a former heroin user, argued that for some users, they have little, or no
13 control over their desire for drug consumption; resulting in problematic usage. While
14 most shared this view, a few opiate naive participants knew heroin users who did not
15 neatly fit such stereotypes, despite still adhering to general stereotypical narratives in
16 their wider discussion.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 For most participants, factors of being an innate 'addict' and 'drug addictiveness'
26 were considered the primary causal factors in defining and differentiating between
27 addiction and controlled use. The creation of such boundaries enabled participants to
28 identify themselves as different from 'addicts', and thus reject a drug addict identity.
29 Addicts were described as easily identifiable. Not only because of their mode of dress²,
30 accents, or visible characteristics. In being visible, heroin addicts are vulnerable; and
31 open for identification as 'The Other' (Bauman, 1989). Thus, they were considered part
32 of a deviant sub-culture, easily recognisable, and subsequently, instantly subjected to
33 societal scorn. Ronald explained how heroin and crack cocaine are more likely to result
34 in problematic use:
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 ² I.e. wearing long sleeve shirts and jackets, which helped cover the 'track marks' on their arms from regular
56 injecting.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 'Depends on what kind of drug user that you're talking about...I've not come
4
5 across a decent heroin addict yet, they would rob you. Crack-heads [also],
6
7 would rob you.' - (Ronald)
8
9

10
11
12 Literature reveals these two drug types as particularly addictive, with sufficient
13 exposure. However, there is also literature that has found users able to control the use
14
15 of such drugs (Hammersley and Ditton, 1994; Shewen and Dalgarno, 2005) and
16
17 challenges the view that drug exposure is a sufficient causal factor resulting in loss of
18
19 control, and risk of addiction. However, such evidence was unknown to participants,
20
21 who generally repeated the views disseminated via 'drug talk'³. Yet, there are several
22
23 scholars who have challenged the 'drug talk' discourse: arguing addiction to be part of a
24
25 social construction. Consequently, any efforts to locate the cause of habitual drug use in
26
27 the user or in the drug is a somewhat pointless exercise. McPhee (2013) notes there is
28
29 substantial evidence from statistical relationships between dislocation and social
30
31 problems like alienation, anomie, crime, and drug addiction. Yet participant Mary, a
32
33 regular cannabis user and occasional opium user, who worked in media did
34
35 acknowledge such labels were somewhat socially constructed. Mary had recently
36
37 conducted research on poverty, and found while many individuals in deprived areas
38
39 wanted to cease taking drugs, much of their root problem stemmed from deeper non-
40
41 drug related issues:
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 ³ A reference to temperance discourses that legitimises demonising users of illegal drugs for choosing intoxication
56 over abstinence.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 '[I] was interviewing kids...in prison [and who had] drug habits... [yet] not that it
4 isn't a drug addict's fault, [but] if [they] had been taken out of poverty and
5 [social exclusion] and [given] some jobs [they may not have consumed drugs],'
6
7
8
9
10 – (Mary)
11
12
13
14

15 This view was expressed by a small minority of participants. The majority tended to
16 view the cause of addiction in biological or psychological explanations and ignored
17 environmental or structural factors related to inequality and deprivation. Yet given that
18 there were a variety of competing explanations for addiction – biological, structure,
19 psychological – all expressed by the participants, merely highlights the complexity of
20 the debate in both the academic and public arena, as to what addiction actually is, and
21 what policy/approach might best suit in addressing such issues. Indeed Yvonne, who
22 had tried heroin and lived with a regular user discussed how several of her social group
23 became addicts while others did not:
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 '[heroin] was pants. The experience wasn't as good as it was made out to be...I
40 just expected something more like when you take E[cstasy], you feel
41 wonderful...[heroin] just wasn't that great. ' - (Yvonne)
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 When probed as to why she did not become an addict and others in her social
50 circle did, Yvonne stated that other things such as 'work', 'friends', and 'kids' were
51 simply more important. It would seem that when other things are held in higher
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 esteem, than the use of drugs, then drug problems are less likely. What is certain is
4
5 that numerous risk factors beyond exposure are important in contributing towards
6
7 problematic usage.
8
9

10
11
12
13 **Identity exchanges and negotiated loss of control**
14

15 Participants discussed how drugs were not only an enjoyable experience, but in
16
17 many cases, drug taking proved somewhat functional in that it allowed participants to
18
19 experience a temporary 'loss of control' and sense of escapism. Rather than using
20
21 terms like 'loss of control' in the strictest sense, participants emphasised that such
22
23 behaviour occurred within created risk boundaries. They preferred to describe
24
25 themselves as creative risk takers, as opposed to irresponsible hedonists:
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 'The whole point of taking drugs with me is I like to get really high to a point,
33
34 where you're not coming down for a while and you feel great.' - (Ronald)
35
36
37
38

39 Like Ronald, most participants gave similar reasons for drug taking, whereby they
40
41 sought to temporarily exchange the contingent identity for a somewhat controlled
42
43 hedonist pursuit. Participants adopted language which described their own drug taking
44
45 as having been risk assessed and thus responsible. Participants actively rejected
46
47 stereotypical descriptions of hedonism. Temporary, and responsible, loss of control
48
49 meant that participants, as with Ronald, did not put their 'master-status' at risk.
50
51
52
53
54 Participants rejected the imposed boundaries byway of addiction discourses, which
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 emphasised drug use as out of control, and risk of addiction. Rather, by making loss
4 of control about pleasure, participants like Ronald exercised their individual agency,
5 temporarily exchanging one identity for another. Drug taking was therefore typically
6 viewed as personal 'me' time, whereby the working day ceased, and recreation began.
7
8 Silvia explained:
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 'It (drug taking) is a reward and a kind punctuation, a knocking off.' - (Silvia).
19
20
21

22 Drugs are used to symbolically create atmospheres/environments that are
23 leisurely, and like in all other human activity, there are serious users, with a high
24 degree of knowledge, intermittent users, and '(drug) tourists', who come and go, but do
25 not actively identify with the 'native', or regular user.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Karen, a daily user of cannabis, and former opiate user stated:
35
36
37
38

39 'Drug user is a pretty vague term for a pretty broad spectrum. Which end of the
40 spectrum should I pick...habitual user or recreational.'- (Karen)
41
42
43
44
45

46 As Karen notes, drug use exists on an ever-shifting continuum, making 'labelling'
47 problematic if at all possible. Interestingly, why participants first started using drugs,
48 and their reasons for continuing, changed little. Ultimately drug use was considered to
49 aid sociability and enjoyment in the company of like-minded individuals. This finding is
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

of course contrary to the typical service user narrative and discussion of drug careers which end in abstinence or death. As this narrative was distinctive, it was therefore important to explore the mechanisms by which participants separated 'recreational' from 'problematic', and through which status was achieved and communicated, exercising control. The purpose or function of the narrative was to create a separate identity, functional insofar as it distanced the participants from the stereotypical problem user, and perhaps also the typical problem users' lack or loss of agency, once labelled and 'outed' as a problem user akin to Stevenson's depiction of Mr Hyde.

Identity concealment

Three distinct forms of identity concealment, through which participants also derived their sense of normality and social inclusion, emerged from the data. These were the 'worker', the 'parent', and the 'hobby enthusiast'. Ronald, a worker, stated:

'I'm just a normal functioning human being. I've got friends ... some of them are very successful and run really successful businesses and they take drugs like myself, just as and when, it's not something they are doing every day.' -
(Ronald)

Ronald normalised his use by categorising it as something which most of his social circle practice. By emphasising that this did not affect his capacity to be an effective worker, Ronald neutralised potentially stigmatising labels. Donald went a step

1
2
3 further, and categorised drug taking as something the majority of people do, and used
4
5 his workplace as a representative sample:
6
7
8
9

10 'Most folk I know take drugs, illegal drugs of one sort or another... probably a
11
12 quarter to a third of the people [in the workplace] take drugs.' – (Donald)
13
14
15
16
17

18 Donald's view that the use of some illegal drugs is essentially normalised, or
19
20 accomodated was quite contrary with how drug takers are typically characterised in
21
22 government policy documents, and perceived by 'moral entrepreneurs' (See Becker,
23
24 1963). While this situation though was possibly unique to Donald's workplace, or even
25
26 an exaggeration, it was a finding which supports the narratives of other participants.
27
28 Donald explained that users may acknowledge each other's drug taking at his place of
29
30 employment, but it was concealed from others out with for fear of reprisal, stigma, or
31
32 persecution:
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

141 'I mean one of the lads; his wife does not know anything of his coke use.' –
142
143 (Donald)
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160

161 Donald referred to this particular friend as 'Escobar-veneer', because he
162
163 consumed so much cocaine, yet hid this behind a 'veneer' or cover of respectability
164
165 that even significant others did not know. Participants spoke at great length about
166
167 concealing their alter ego identity even during recreational times, and while they
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200

1
2
3 considered drug taking was very much common practice amongst most of their peer
4
5 networks, the governing societal discourse meant that they still had to conceal it
6
7 from others, including loved ones. This was particularly true for those who were
8
9 parents. Juliet explained why one of her friends can never become one 'in the know'
10
11 regards her drug taking:
12
13

14
15
16
17 'We have so much in common; I could talk to her all day. But I would never
18
19 bring her on a night out, as I've heard her comment on people taking drugs.
20
21 Because I think she is so against them, she believes it's a bad thing. Although
22
23 we are friends she is so against it so I choose not to tell her anything.' – (Juliet)
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Thus, there was considerable risk attached to drug use disclosure in certain
31
32 workplaces, Colette explained:
33
34
35
36

37 'You couldn't just talk about this to anybody, like people in your work or
38
39 whatever.' (Colette)
40
41
42
43

44 'Child protection' social policy is underpinned by the discourse that drug using
45
46 parents are more likely to practice poor parenting, and that their drug wants may
47
48 supersede their children's needs (Barnard and McKeganey, 1999). Such beliefs stem
49
50 from temperance dogma⁴. Several cannabis using parents discussed how they
51
52
53
54
55

56 ⁴ See Hogarth's engraving titled 'Gin Lane'
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 limited consumption to when their children were in bed or staying at a
4 relative's/friend's house. For parents who consumed drugs such as ecstasy or
5 cocaine, this was typically limited to weekends: again, when children were being
6 supervised by other adults.
7
8
9
10
11

12
13 Being a parent meant negotiating the identity nexus of parent/user. Thus,
14 one identity was often decanted for another depending on the circumstances and
15 setting. As such, drug use was risk assessed, controlled, and typically confined to
16 'recreational time'. It would even impact upon levels and duration of consumption
17 during these times. Isabel explained that she was a parent of a young child, and
18 how she managed the risks of intoxication, and loss of control:
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 'With a young child in the group that we socialise with, I always take less
31 than them and am always aware that I've got to leave. If they are going to
32 start taking an E pill usually to their one, I take half ... I've got to get home
33 and be responsible and all that.' (Isabel).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Isabel pointed out that even during the identity exchange which occurs in
43 recreational time, she had to be aware of the impact consumption may have on her
44 other identity as a parent, and thus put in place certain risk boundaries.
45
46
47
48

49 Those who adopted the 'hobby enthusiast' identity as part of the concealment from
50 law-abiding citizen to drug user, included a variety of activities. These ranged from
51 being a 'petrol head' who spent time racing cars and bikes, to 'club tourists' who
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 would use drugs at certain clubs/parties, or other social events, to those who
4
5 engaged in sports to mitigate the negative effects of prolonged use of stimulant
6
7 type drugs. These responsible risk assessors required safe places where they could
8
9 express this aspect of their personal identity with like-minded others, where there
10
11 appeared to be a group cohesion, as those who 'use' and those who are not part of
12
13 the social worlds of the purposely unseen. Drug use for club tourists, particularly
14
15 older participants, was seen as a way of tearing down social barriers like class and
16
17 other subjective divisions. Harry explained:
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 'I met a lot of people through it (MDMA) as well too, clubbers, people that I
26
27 would probably not normally have a great deal in common with, from very
28
29 affluent backgrounds, when we were doing the club thing.' - (Harry)
30
31
32
33
34

35 Harry indicated that drug use in certain social events was a way of bonding
36
37 users who would usually operate independently of one another. Drug- taking
38
39 environments were largely perceived as classless environments where social
40
41 distinctions were created through having knowledge about drugs, as opposed to
42
43 what one consumes, owns or has achieved. The clothes, music, lifestyle all
44
45 interacted to create aspects of an identity that allowed a sense of belonging, where
46
47 drug taking was not condemned as irresponsible, but tasteful and even essential to
48
49 the enjoyment of music. Yet, for others, like those who had a predominantly
50
51 sporting identity, such as Kirk (a rambler and climber), or John (a martial arts
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

expert), drugs fitted into their lifestyles better than other socialising substances like alcohol. Kirk explained why he tended to favour illegal drug use over alcohol consumption:

I hate anything that gives me a hangover... it doesn't suit what I do with the rest of my life....Me and my [friend] were into climbing and we were coming back from weekends, totally knackered and we used to drink in a boozier and we heard about sulph or wiz (amphetamine sulphate) that gave you a bit of a buzz. It meant you were wide awake, and we thought it would match our weekend's hill-walking, climbing.' - (Kirk)

These participants, like Kirk, enjoyed risk, and considered alcohol as 'empty carbs' or gave participants a 'hangover'. Stimulant drugs were seen to fit their particular lifestyles better. The use of the stimulants amphetamine and cocaine enabled Kirk and his friend to pursue energetic pastimes. Several participants indicated that drugs were functional, and not just in the social nexus. Sport tends to overall be in general a group/social activity to one extent or another. Identity concealments and exchanges, it would seem, are possible due to the blur in the discursive divides between non-user, user, recreational user, and problematic user, and the ability of the users to successfully switch identities, and exercise an agency unavailable to know and 'outed' problem users. Thus, for the participants, drug use was merely one part of an eclectic identity. In rejecting stereotypical user and

1
2
3 problem user labels they avoided negative social reaction and being discovered or
4
5 labelled as a 'problem' drug user. It was this fear that motivated them to remain
6
7 purposefully hidden and unseen.
8
9

10
11
12
13 **Discussion**
14

15 This paper contends that the personal identity discourse of participants is an
16
17 attempt to align themselves with non-user identities to prevent socially damaging
18
19 stigma. Participants presented themselves as part of moral social groupings, while
20
21 simultaneously engaging in certain behaviours routinely scapegoated and stigmatised.
22
23

24 The participant responses suggested that the functional and instrumental value
25
26 of drugs was the 'nexus' around which a significant part of their hidden social life
27
28 existed. Consumption of drugs was often confined to weekends and social occasions
29
30 and the use of stimulants in particular was considered purposeful insofar as they
31
32 allowed some users to stay awake and/or consume alcohol without succumbing to its
33
34 depressant properties and exhibiting a loss of control.
35
36

37 If the experiences and perceptions of our participants potentially reflect wider
38
39 norms and a significant proportion of Scotland's population have experienced drugs, or
40
41 know people who have, who did not become problem users, then it could be argued
42
43 that we reconsider conceptualising drug users as 'offender-addicts in waiting'. In the
44
45 past a 'drug-user' was definable as a member of a deviant sub-group (Becker, 1963). It
46
47 is without doubt that adopting an 'addict' identity or being known as an addict is a
48
49 radical shift in individuality, and highly stigmatised (Radcliffe & Stevens, 2008).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Common misperceptions of drug users construct stigmatised identities based on misidentifying drug of choice with pathology (Anthony, et. al., 1994) or on their route of administration (e.g. junkies and injectors) (Samaha & Robinson, 2005; Radcliffe and Stevens 2008), or their type of crime (drug traffickers, dealers etc.) (Yacoubian 2001, Galenianos, et al., 2017; EMCDDA 2017). We require explanations for drug taking that move away from simple constructions of deviance and labelling. It is no longer appropriate to label drug users as 'outsiders' (Becker 1967), as this is only a small part of their personal and social identity. The management of an aspect of identity, which must be concealed to protect self-esteem and status as 'normal', is required (Goffman, 1963).

Identification for the participants in this research was characterised in terms of protecting esteem and managing potential social affronts. Users construct positive identities by rejecting negative aspects of identities that are potentially stigmatising (being a heroin smoker but rejecting emphatically the identity of drug injector). Illicit drug use may serve as a marker of identity boundaries in a way that is potentially misleading. Judgements of similarity to, and difference from, others, which are constructed on this basis, may not work outside the small-scale settings of drug use (Hammersley et al., (2001).

These processes, previously highlighted by the labelling model in the sociology of deviance (e.g. Becker, 1953), are also central to Goffman's interactionism perspective and are useful in the study of identity (Jenkins, 1996). Nonetheless, there has been an increasing merging in the ways in which drug users understand and foreground their

status as non-deviant, ordinary citizens and how they are externally categorised (Radcliffe & Stevens 2008; McPhee 2013). Signification, negotiation and categorisation are likely to combine in different ways to produce a range of potential identity constructions. Some studies find that users who view drugs as a large part of their lives struggle to maintain or develop other aspects of their social identity, such as parents (Taylor, 1994), students (Brewer & Pierce, 2005), masculine men (Caceres & Cortinas, 2005) or non-addicted, successful drug dealers (Bourgeois and Pearson, 1995; Schensul et al., 2005). Bauman (2000) helpfully summarises the complexity of this situation by stating:

“perhaps instead of talking about identity, inherited or acquired, it would be more in keeping with the realities of the globalising world to speak of identification, a never ending, always incomplete, unfinished open-ended activity in which we all, by necessarily or by choice, are engaged” (Bauman, 2000:152).

It is evident that our research participants manage clandestine identities by disclosing their drug use *only* to others who they believed would not condemn them. The interviewees expressed frustration at how their lifestyle choices were perceived by ‘other’ drug users (alcohol users in particular), in government policy documents and in the drug talk which underpins addiction discourse, and supporters of drug prohibition, as a moral battle.

Conclusion

Jock Young (2004) has argued that the study of deviance disregards three major problems in its measurement. These are the problems of representativeness, of the

1
2
3 plurality of definition, and claims to truth based on the previous two categories. The
4
5 term 'drug user' is a signifier saturated with meaning and symbolism immediately
6
7 brought into play when this label is used. In one single concept, that of the 'addict
8
9 offender', and the perceived inevitable 'loss of control' that results from exposure to
10
11 drugs, we find embedded a simple, static explanation about what drugs are, and the
12
13 power they have to remove reason and rationality. The pejorative terms used to
14
15 denote drug problems such as 'abuse' and 'misuse' and the complications associated
16
17 with drug consumption by social actors signifies a universal view of users not as human
18
19 beings, who choose to do something that is condemned, but as 'others', a force that
20
21 terrifies by contaminating a good ordered society. Drug 'addict', 'junkie', 'problem user',
22
23 'offender', 'waster', 'poor parent', and numerous other terms within this lexicon render
24
25 into thought drug users as different and outside of a moral community.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Research into drug use from the beginnings of the twentieth Century onwards
33
34 concentrated on the addict as different and linked drug use to crime and pathology
35
36 (Glassner and Loughlin, 1987; Alexander, 2008). The large body of social science
37
38 research which challenges 'dope fiend' mythology is little known by the public and is
39
40 available only in specialist texts, and in academic institutions.
41
42
43

44 This paper introduces a new concept into the lexicon of social research, that of
45
46 the 'purposively hidden drug user'. We allude to this concept in our reference to
47
48 Stevenson's novella. Such a term allocates some power to drug users labelled deviant
49
50 due to their choice to use illegal drugs, but who maintain the clandestine identity of a
51
52 Mr. Hyde. The terminology endorses the active decision of these research participants
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

to remain part of a wider community that rejects the use of drugs as immoral and criminal, and how they manage to maintain a clean identity by intentionally concealing deviant activity by veils of respectability and selective conformity, exercising individual agency.

The data indicates that the use of illegal drugs have become accommodated for these participants; however, users are routinely stigmatised, and all use is thus linked to problem users, who are most often domiciled in pockets of deprivation in the UK, vulnerable and likely to be caught within the criminal justice system as ‘drug offenders’, unable to exercise agency as active subjects. This allows the discursive gaps between the stigmatised outsider, the ‘offender in waiting’, and the illicit, illegal drugs user to be closed, and creates self-fulfilling prophecy. Golub et al (2005) argue drug use in the US inner-city involves relations between drug sub-cultures and individual identity development. Pressures to belong to street-cultures in the US context means the agency of those with limited attachment to conventions may not mature out from using drugs such as heroin, crack and marijuana. Golub et al refer to this trajectory as “sub-cultural inertia”. This meaning of the latter connects with the persistence of the stigmatised outsider whose connectedness to mainstream norms appears ambivalent. Their “offender-in-waiting” status is sustained both by a tenuous attachment to convention and the strength of the pull of their sub-cultural affinities.

The analysis of our data revealed the techniques the participants utilised to remain purposely hidden, are due to their abilities to exercise agency, and avoid such ‘disabling’ labels, with attendant social affronts, stigma and discrimination (McPhee et

al., 2013). Three themes of identification were discussed in terms of (1) Identity rejections: referring to how the participants viewed themselves as essentially normal, and rejected the addict identity using several arguments with which to delineate identity difference, including biological arguments - addicts were born not made; that some drugs, such as heroin, inevitably caused problems although this was only true of the opiate naive; and structural factors as causal to use and problems. (2) Identity exchanges: the participants were able to voluntarily engage in a temporary loss of control, which as volitional separated them from problem users (3) Identity concealments: referring to the necessity of concealing an identity as functioning drug users to preserve an untainted identity. Several participants were parents. This paper discovered techniques used by participants to neutralise risk by creating boundaries that separate 'moderate' and 'compulsive use' patterns. Rodner et al (2005) argue drug-users' positive self-representations in Stockholm giving rise to their "drug-wise" self-control and knowledge about drugs is enabling of their capacity to draw boundaries between themselves and other "deviant" drug users, and to sustain responsible lifestyles outside of their drug-taking choices. Akin to the research participants, through the power of individual agency they challenge the prevalent construct of illicit drug users as helpless victims of addiction to evil substances.

The data presented in the article is consistent with the narratives we have identified in the qualitative literature. The data endorses the view that the consumption of illicit leisure activity is not confined to any one subculture. Young (2003) has argued that even socially excluded groups, such as problem drug users, can embrace

consumption as a way out of their economic and social situation. The argument is that drugs and crime are rational responses to a culture that views those who do not conform to the 'norms' of abstinence from illegal drugs, in particular heroin users, as unproductive, irrelevant, and disposable humans lying beyond an "iron cage" of rationality.

Max Weber famously argues that this thesis typifies the morally dutiful disenchanted landscape of Western capitalism. Bourgois (2000) argues that even in methadone interventions designed in the US to treat heroin addiction a newly designed iron cage is imposed, and one which worsens the cultural circumstance of those subjected to this "moral discipline". Despite the methadone user being classed as "patient" not "criminal", not only does this dependency cause anger and depression it also impacts their cultural integration and ability to recover from stigma. Judged as a type of iron cage the methadone clinic, Bourgeois (2000) discovered, merely re-distributes an outsider illegitimacy in order to make these users more manageable to policing. What Hammersley (2001) calls a "hidden disability" remains but these US heroin addicts are also estranged from the street. Through being able to strategically conceal their illicit drug-taking activities our sample manage a "hidden disability" without status loss or the stigma of a spoiled identity. Their drug use appeared to be one form of an identity marker whose meaning was arguably helpful to their holistic wellbeing.

References

- Alexander B.K. (2008) *The Globalisation Of Addiction: A Study In Poverty Of The Spirit*. Oxford University Press.
- Anthony J.C, Warner L.A and Kessler R.C. (1994) Comparative Epidemiology of Dependence on Tobacco, Alcohol, Controlled Substance, and Inhalants: Basic Findings from the National Comorbidity Survey, *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 2(3):244-68.
- Ashton M, (2008) 'The New Abstentionists', *Druglink*, March-April 2008.
- Barnard, M., McKeganey, N., (1999) The impact of parental problem drug use on children: what is the problem and what can be done to help? *Journal of Addiction* (5), 552-559
- Bauman, Z., (1998) 'Freedom', Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bauman, Z., (2001) '*The Individualized Society*'. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2001) Identity in the globalising world. *Social Anthropology*, 9(2), 121-129. doi:10.1017/S096402820100009X
- Becker, H. (1953). "Becoming a marihuana User." *American Journal of Sociology*. 59, 235-242.
- Becker, H. (1963) *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*, New York: The Free Press.
- Becker, H. (1967) 'Whose Side Are We On?' *Social Problems* 14(3): 239—47.
- Berridge, V. and Thom, B. (1996), Research and Policy: What Determines the Relationship? *Policy Studies* 17(1): 23–34.
- Bourgeois, P., Pearson, C (1995) Hope to die a dope fiend', *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 10, No. 4 587-593.
- Bourgeois, P. (2000) "Disciplining Addictions": The Biopolitics of Methadone and Heroin in the United States, *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry*, 24: 165-195.
- Bjerg, O. (2008) Drug Addiction and Capitalism: Too Close to the Body, *Body and Society*, 14 (2): 1-22.
- Brewer, M. B., & Pierce, K. P. (2005) Social identity complexity and out-group tolerance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 428-437.
- Brown, M (2007), Mapping discursive closings in the war on drugs', *Crime Media Culture* 2007 3: 11.
- Caceres, C. F and Cortinas, J. I. (2005) 'Fantasy Island: An ethnography of alcohol and gender roles in a Latin gay bar', in: Palacious, W. (Eds) *Cocktails and Dreams: Perspectives on Drug and Alcohol use*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

- Duke, K. (2001). Evidence-based policy-making: the interplay between research and the development of prison drugs policy. *Criminal Justice*, 1(3): 277-300.
- European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (2017), *European Drug Report 2017: Trends and Developments*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- Frank, O. and Snijders, T. (1994). *Estimating the size of hidden populations using snowball sampling*. *Journal of Official Statistics* 10, 53-67.
- Galenianos, M, Gavazza, A., (2017) a structural model of the retail market for illicit drugs, *American Economic Review*. 107, (3), 858-896.
- Glassner B. and Loughlin, J. (1987), 'Drugs in adolescent worlds', New York: St Martins.
- Goffman, E. (1990), 'Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity', London, Penguin.
- Goffman, E. (1959) 'The *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, London: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1971) *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*, New York: Basic Books.
- Golub, A and Johnson, B.D. (2005) Subculture, evolution and illicit drug use, *Addiction Research and Theory*, 13 (3): 217-229.
- Goode, E., (2006), 'The Sociology of Drug Use', 21st century sociology, Sage publications.
- Griffiths, P., Gossop, M., Powis, B. and Strang, J. (1993) Reaching hidden populations of drug users by privileged access interviewers: methodological and practical issues, *Addiction*, vol. 88, 1617-1626.
- Hammersley R., Ditton J., (1994) Cocaine Careers in a Sample of Scottish Users, *Addiction Research and Theory* 2(1):51-69
- Hammersley, R., Jenkins, R. & Reid, M. (2001) 'Cannabis use and social identity'. *Addiction Research and Theory*, 9 (2): 133-150.
- Hammersley, R. (2011) Developing a sociology of normal substance use, *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 22: 413-414.
- Headland, T. N., K. L. Pike, and M. Harris, eds. (1990), *Emics and Etics: The Insider/Outsider Debate*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Jenkins, R. (1996) '*Social Identity*', London: Routledge.
- Klein, A., (2011) "Not much new in the new drug strategy", Editorial comment, *Drugs and Alcohol Today*, Vol. 11 Issue: 1, pp.2-6, <https://doi.org/10.5042/daat>.
- Leshner A., (2000) 'Treating the Brain in Drug Abuse', 15 *National Institute of Drug Abuse* 4, 2 available at http://www.drugabuse.gov/NIDA_Notes/NNVol15N4/DirRepVol15N4.html (accessed December 2009).

- McPhee, I., Brown A.M, Martin C.R. (2013) 'Stigma and perceptions of recovery in Scotland: a qualitative study of injecting drug users attending methadone treatment', *Drugs and Alcohol Today*, Vol: 13:4.
- McPhee, I., Martin C.H., Martin C.R, and Sneider, A., (2012) Exploring the consequences of how Scotland interprets the UK Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, *Drugs and Alcohol Today* 12 (3) 146-155.
- McPhee, J. (2013). *The intentionally unseen: illicit & illegal drug use in Scotland: Exploring 'drug talk' in the 21st century*, Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Neale, J., Nettleton S., & Pickering L., (2010) Recovery from problem drug use: What can we learn from the sociologist Erving Goffman, *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 18:1, 3-9, DOI: [10.3109/09687631003705546](https://doi.org/10.3109/09687631003705546)
- Orne, J. (2013) *Queers in the Line of Fire: Goffman's Stigma Revisited*, *The Sociological Quarterly*, 54, 229-253.
- Parker, H., Aldridge, J. Measham, F. (1998). 'Illegal leisure - The normalization of adolescent recreational drug use'. London: Routledge.
- Pearson, G. (2001) 'Normal drug use: Ethnographic fieldwork among an adult network of recreational drug users in inner London', *Substance Use and Misuse*, 36 (1-2): 167-200.
- Radcliffe, P. & Stevens, A. (2008) 'Are drug treatment services only for 'thieving junkie scumbags'? Drug users and the management of stigmatised identities', *Social Science and Medicine*, 67, 7:1065-73.
- Rodner, S. (2005) "I am not a drug abuser, I am a drug user": A discourse analysis of 44 drug user's construction of identity, *Addiction Research and Theory*, 13 (4): 333-346.
- Rogers, M. (2012). Contextualizing Theories and Practices of Bricolage Research. *The Qualitative Report*, 17(48), 1-17. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol17/iss48/3>
- Samaha A-N, Robinson TE. (2005) 'Why does the rapid delivery of drugs to the brain promote addiction?', *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences*, 26(2):82-7.
- Szasz, T., (2003), *Ceremonial Chemistry: The Ritual Persecution of Drugs, Addicts, and Pushers*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.
- Schensul, J.J.; Convey, M.; and Burkholder, G. (2005) 'Challenges in measuring concurrency, agency and intentionality in poly-drug research'. *Addictive Behaviours* 30: 571–574.
- Stevenson, Robert Louis. *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. New York: Scribner, 1886; Bartleby.com, 2000. www.bartleby.com/1015/.
- Seddon, T., (2005) 'Drugs, Crime and Social Exclusion *Social Context and Social Theory in British Drugs–Crime Research* ', *British Journal of Criminology* (July 2006) 46 (4): 680-703.
- Seddon, T., Ralphs, R., & Williams, L. (2008), 'Risk, security and the 'criminalization' of British drug policy', *British Journal of Criminology*, 48, 818–834.

Seddon, T. (2011) "Explaining Drug Policy: Towards an historical sociology of policy change." *International Journal of Drug Policy* 22, no. 6: 415-419.

Shewan, D. and Dalgarno, P. (2005) 'Low levels of negative health and social outcomes among non-treatment heroin users in Glasgow (Scotland): evidence for controlled heroin use?', *British Journal of Health Psychology*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 33–48

Stryker, S., (1968). "Identity Salience and Role Performance". *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 4 (4): 558–64.

Taylor, A. (1994) 'Women Drug Users: An Ethnography of a Female Injecting Community', Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weinberg, D. (2002) On the Embodiment of Addiction, *Body and Society*, 8 (4): 1-19.

Yacoubian, G. S., (2001) Assessing ADAM's Domain: Past Problems and Future Prospects, *Contemporary Drug Problems*, Vol 27, Issue 1, pp. 121 – 13

Young, J. (2003) "Merton with Energy, Katz with Structure: The sociology of vindictiveness and the criminology of transgression" *Theoretical Criminology*, vol. 7(3): 389-414.

Young, J. (2004) 'Voodoo Criminology and the Numbers Game', in J. Ferrell, K. Hayward, W. Morrison and M. Presdee (Eds) '*Cultural Criminology Unleashed*'. London: Glasshouse Press.

Table 1 The research participants		
		number
Sex	Male	12
	female	12
Age	20+	06
	30+	07
	40+	08
	50+	03
Drug use pattern	Abstinent	02
	Intermittent users	17
	Daily users	05

Source: the intentionally unseen research participant interviews.

Table 2 the research participants' demographic data										
Pseudonym	age	sex	area	employment	have children	Accomm	qualification	Drug 1	Drug 2	Used heroin
Isabel	35+	F	E	Self employed	yes	owned	HNC	cocaine	GHB	No
Silvia	40+	F	E	Self employed	yes	rented	Degree	MDMA	Alcohol	No
Robert	35+	M	E	Self employed	no	rented	C & Guilds	cannabis	GHB	No
Alison	35+	F	E	student	no	rented	Dip.	MDMA	GHB	No
Kirk	52	M	I	Self employed	no	owned	Dip.	cocaine	MDMA	No
Karen	34	F	E	catering	no	rented	HND	cannabis	MDMA	No
Rob	45	M	E	catering	yes	rented	HND	cannabis	MDMA	Yes
Gilbert	26	M	G	engineering	no	rented	MSc	cocaine	MDMA	No
John	45+	M	G	Self employed	yes	owned	Degree	cocaine	NPS ¹	No
Donald	50+	M	I	Emergency services	yes	owned	Degree	cannabis	MDMA	No
Jamie	25	M	G	Builder	no	owned	C & Guilds	MDMA	cocaine	No
Chris	26	M	G	Insurance	no	rented	Higher	cocaine	MDMA	No
Ronald	52	M	I	Risk management	yes	owned	Prof. Qual	MDMA	cannabis	yes
Colette	25	F	G	Office	no	rented	Degree	cocaine	Ketamine	No
Juliet	24	F	G	Office	no	rented	A level	MDMA	cocaine	No
Mr B	26	M	G	Landscaping	no	rented	GCSE's	alcohol	cocaine	No
Renee	32	F	E	unemployed	no	rented	Dip.	NPS	Ketamine	yes
Mary	41	F	B	Self employed	no	owned	none	MDMA	cannabis	yes
Mr K	42	M	B	Caring profession	no	owned	Degree	cocaine	cannabis	yes
Millie	49	F	G	media	yes	owned	MSc.	cannabis	MDMA	No
Mr HM	40	M	G	Caring profession	yes	owned	SVQ3	cannabis	MDMA	No
Helen	35	F	E	Student support services	yes	owned	HND	cannabis	MDMA	No
Kath	35	F	E	catering	no	rented	HND	cannabis	MDMA	No
Yvonne	29	F	B	unemployed	yes	rented	none	cocaine	MDMA	Yes

¹ New Psychoactive Substances ('Legal Highs' or 'Chemical Highs'), refers to in both instances Mephedrone or other synthetic cathinones